

Attorney Docket No.: T7106(C)  
Serial No.: 10/583,230  
Filing Date: June 16, 2006  
Confirmation No.: 8226

## **REMARKS**

### ***Election/ Restrictions***

The Examiner has restricted the following inventions:

**Group I:** Claim(s) 1-6 drawn to a microfluidics device.

**Group II:** Claim 7-12 drawn to a process for preparing a two phase composition.

Applicants elect with traverse **Group I** which encompasses claims 1-6 drawn to a microfluidics device.

### ***Amendments to the Claims***

Claim 7 has been amended to specify that the resistance of each of the upstream channels is at least 10 times larger than the resistance of the downstream channel or channels as disclosed on page 9, lines 22-24.

### ***Traverse of Restriction***

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the restriction requirements in view of the above amendment and following argument.

Attorney Docket No.: T7106(C)  
Serial No.: 10/583,230  
Filing Date: June 16, 2006  
Confirmation No.: 8226

PCT RULE 13.2. specifies that

"Where a group of inventions is claimed in one and the same international application, the requirement of unity of invention referred to in Rule 13.1 shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features. The expression "special technical features" shall mean those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.

The process recited in amended claim 7 utilizes a microfluidics system having exactly the same special technical features as the microfluidics system recited in claim 1, namely,

*"A microfluidic system comprising first and second fluid supply sources supplying first and second microfluidic reactors via an upstream channel, the first and second reactors each having at least one downstream channel, wherein for at least one reactor, the resistance of each of its upstream channels is at least 10 times larger than the resistance of the downstream channel or channels"*

The fact that Group I claims (the system) does not require the particulars of the process recited in Group II claims is not the controlling factor governing unity of invention. Claims 1 and 7 share one or more of the same special technical features and thus satisfy the condition for unity of invention. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the restriction requirement be withdrawn and that the claims be examined together.

Attorney Docket No.: T7106(C)  
Serial No.: 10/583,230  
Filing Date: June 16, 2006  
Confirmation No.: 8226

If a telephone conversation would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, applicants' undersigned agent invites the Examiner to telephone him at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Michael P. Aronson", written over a horizontal line.

Michael P. Aronson  
Registration No. 50,372  
Agent for Applicants

MPA/sm  
Tel. No. 201-894-2412 or 845-708-0188